```
ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 1 of 44
 1
                     IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                          SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                               HOUSTON DIVISION
 3
 4
     DORA SOLARES, ET AL.,
                 Plaintiffs,
 5
                                         ) CIVIL ACTION NO.
     VS.
                                         ) 1:20-323-LHR
 6
     RALPH DIAZ, ET AL.,
 7
                 Defendants.
                                         )11:38 A.M.
 8
 9
                            PRE-MOTION CONFERENCE
                   BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEE H. ROSENTHAL
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
                              DECEMBER 10, 2024
11
     APPEARANCES:
12
     FOR PLAINTIFFS:
     MR. ERIN R. DARLING
13
     Law Offices of Erin Darling
     3435 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2910
14
     Los Angeles, California 90010
15
     (323) 736-2230
     FOR DEFENDANTS:
16
     MR. JEREMY DUGGAN
17
     MR. DAVID KUCHINSKY
     California Office of the Attorney General
     300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
18
     Los Angeles, California 90013
19
     (213)269-6442
20
     FOR DEFENDANT SILVA:
     MS. LYNNE G. STOCKER
21
     Andrada & Associates
     1939 Harrison Street, Suite 612
22
     Oakland, California 94612
      (510)287-4160
23
24
25
     Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
     produced by computer.
```

d	ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122	Filed 12/18/24	Page 2 of 44
1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:		-
2	COURT REPORTER:		
3	Heather Alcaraz, CSR, FCRR, RMR Official Court Reporter 515 Rusk, Suite 8004 Houston, Texas 77002		
4			
5	(713)250-5584		
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

4	ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 3 of 44
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	(The following hearing was held via video conference.)
4	* * *
11:38:57 5	THE COURT: All right. I think we're ready in the
6	Solares case.
11:39:08 7	MR. DUGGAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Jeremy Duggan
8	for Defendant Burnes.
11:39:14 9	MS. STOCKER: Morning, Your Honor. Lynne Stocker for
10	Defendant Silva.
11:39:2411	MR. KUCHINSKY: And good morning, Your Honor. I'm
12	David Kuchinsky. I'm cocounsel with Mr. Duggan for Defendant
13	Burnes.
11:39:2814	THE COURT: All right. Who are we missing, if anyone?
11:39:31 15	MS. STOCKER: Plaintiff's counsel.
11:39:3216	THE COURT: That's what I thought. All right. We'll
17	give them a few minutes. I think we are a little bit early, not
18	much. I'm going to put you on mute and stop video until
19	everyone's joined.
11:39:5220	(Pause in proceedings.)
11:43:2321	MR. DUGGAN: Good morning, Mr. Darling. Is
22	Mr. Sterling joining us also today?
11:43:2723	MR. DARLING: No, just me.
11:43:2924	THE COURT: Do we now have everyone we need?
11:43:3125	MR. DARLING: Yes.

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 4 of 44

THE COURT: All right. I think -- everyone except

Mr. Darling, I think, has stated their appearance.

Mr. Darling?

11:43:32 1

11:43:39

11:43:40

11:43:44

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

11:44:0412

11:44:3518

11:44:3619

11:45:0025

MR. DARLING: My apologies. Yes, Erin Darling on behalf of plaintiff.

THE COURT: All right. So we have a lot of discovery issues. I propose we just work through them. I think a lot of them are going to be pretty easy to resolve, and it may be that we get to a point where you see a common theme in my approach that will give you a -- enough guidance on some of the other areas.

But unless anyone can suggest a better way, I'd like to work through the discovery issues and save for another day argument on the motions to dismiss and the motion to remand, all right? So the first issue in discovery that I see is a request for production No. 14 -- give you a minute to get to the same place I am.

MR. DARLING: Okay.

THE COURT: -- which seeks documents regarding allegations of the use of force against Burnes for the five years up to the date of the accident and then up until the present -- or prior to the date of the incident up to the present. Frankly, this seems overbroad to the point of being irrelevant.

This is -- the allegations against Mr. Burnes in this

Filed 12/18/24 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Page 5 of 44 case are that he bypassed the standardized required 1 2 administrative committee process that should have been undertaken before celling two inmates in the same space, and 3 that wasn't done in this case. The allegation is that even 4 though Mr. Osuna was known to be dangerous, the procedures were 5 still not followed. 6 Dif- -- very different allegations involving a 11:45:30 7 different type of excessive force seem to be irrelevant to this 8 case, so I think this request to compel should be denied. 9 Any questions about that one? 11:45:5110 11:45:5611 MR. DARLING: Maybe -- I may want to go back to it, but nothing at this point, Your Honor. 12 11:46:0113 THE COURT: Okay. Let's go through them. You may 14 find that some of what you need is going to be picked up in some 15 of the other requests. 11:46:1016 MR. DARLING: Okay. 11:46:1117 THE COURT: Fifteen asks for documents regarding allegations of dishonesty against Burnes. Same five years 18 before the date of the incident up till the present are sought. 19 This is, again, pretty broad. Allegations by whom? By inmates? 20 By supervisors? Public? It's unclear. 21 I think if you narrow the scope, however, there 11:46:3922 certainly is a relevance to the present allegations since one of 23 24 the allegations is that Mr. Burnes covered up the fact that he

did not go through the proper administrative procedures before

25

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 6 of 44 assigning Mr. Osuna and Mr. Solares [sic] to the same cell, and 1 2 then that he dishonestly covered that up. I think there is some relevance, but I think it has to 11:47:11 3 be narrowed to seek requests for -- to request documents showing 4 dishonesty in the course of his duties. 5 MR. DARLING: Your Honor, on -- on the issue of 11:47:29 7 dishonesty, yes, it would be CDCR documents. So it would be, you know, allegations by inmates or allegations by CDCR against 8 Burnes himself. It's not like, you know, anything out in -- in 9 his personal, you know, life or anything like that --10 THE COURT: Well, what I don't see as relevant are 11:47:4811 allegations that he took something from the commissary --12 11:47:5813 MR. DARLING: Understood. THE COURT: -- or took too many meals from the 11:47:5814 15 cafeteria, something like that. 11:48:0816 MR. DARLING: Sure. 11:48:0917 THE COURT: But it's lying about alleged deficiencies in the way he conducted his job. 18 MR. DARLING: Right. Yeah. 11:48:1219 11:48:1320 THE COURT: Mr. Duggan, you look like you want to say 21 something. 11:48:1622 MR. DUGGAN: Yes, Your Honor. Are we talking about 23 sustained allegations or even unsustained allegations from 24 inmates? THE COURT: I suppose -- I imagine you are seeking --11:48:2925

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 7 of 44 MR. DUGGAN: We would oppose production of 11:48:34 1 2 unsubstantiated allegations from -- from inmates of dishonesty, 3 yes. THE COURT: All right. Let's start with sustained 11:48:41 allegations, and if we see a need to go beyond that, we can 5 revisit it. 6 Okay. Sixteen, allegation --11:48:56 7 11:48:58 8 MR. DARLING: Sorry. THE COURT: Yes. 11:48:59 9 MR. DARLING: Because then there's the question -- so, 11:49:0010 11 Mr. Duggan, because I don't know what you -- what was put under 12 the protective order. Is -- is the -- is the defendants' 13 position that there are sustained allegations that are not being 14 produced -- that have not been produced? 11:49:1815 MR. DUGGAN: No. 11:49:2116 MR. DARLING: But -- so --11:49:2317 THE COURT: So you've already got them? Is that right, Mr. Duggan? It's already been produced? 18 11:49:2919 MR. DARLING: No. 11:49:2920 MR. DUGGAN: Well, yeah, no, we haven't produced any sustained allegations of dishonesty because there aren't any. 21 11:49:3522 THE COURT: Well, that makes this a nullity, then. 23 Are there any unsustained allegations, yes or no? MR. DUGGAN: Yes. From inmates, yes. 11:49:4224 **THE COURT:** Are there allegations of -- are there 11:49:4325

Page 8 of 44

Filed 12/18/24

Document 122 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM allegations as -- that Mr. Burnes lied to cover up 1 2 inmate-on-inmate harm from inmates who shared a cell or were in 3 close quarters? MR. DUGGAN: There's 60 documents or so listed in our 11:50:07 privileged log. So I would -- I would want to double-check, but 5 I don't remember one like that, yeah. 6 THE COURT: All right. If there is anything that is 11:50:15 7 a -- even an unsustained allegation of a failure to observe --8 9 of Mr. Burnes attempting to cover up failures to observe 10 procedures required in managing inmate access to other inmates, that is, putting them in the same cell, putting them in the same 11 12 rec areas at the same time, things like that -- even if they're 13 unsustained. 11:51:0414 All right? MR. DARLING: Your Honor, if I could -- if I may, 11:51:0515 16 the -- it's -- the other issue, in an allegation against Burnes, 17 is that the dishonesty was in just doing paperwork. It -especially as it related to not just assigning Romero, but in 18 reclassifying Osuna. So I would ask that the dishonesty not 19 just be about inmates accessing inmates, but just dishonesty in 20 terms of filling out, you know, forms or going through

> procedures as it relates to classification generally. THE COURT: All right. I think that's reasonable.

> > MR. DARLING: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Are we ready to move to 16?

22

21

11:51:4223

11:51:4724

11:51:5025

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 9 of 44

MR. DARLING: Plaintiff is.

11:51:53 1

11:51:54 2

11:52:16 6

11:52:17 7

11:52:2510

3

4

5

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

25

11:53:1620

11:53:2422

11:53:4124

THE COURT: This -- allegations of bias, racial, gender, sexual orientation against Burnes, again for the same five years before, up to the present time period, I don't understand how this has any bearing.

MR. DARLING: Your Honor, so --

THE COURT: It's too broad. If you can narrow it so that it's relevant, I'd reconsider, but as is it's too broad to be relevant.

MR. DARLING: So, first, Your Honor, under California law, Pitchess allows for -- a Pitchess motion allows for personnel complaints or allegations of bias that include racial, gender, sexual orientation, and I think here where -- where, you know, there's -- not only is the decedent Latino, but that there's -- essentially, there's weird regional gang stuff within the prison system. And so if there's bias in favor of, say, one prison gang over another or -- because the prison gangs are racial. It -- that is relevant because it's -- it's connected to who gets housed together.

So if there's some bias that he has against, essentially, Southern Hispanics, that's an issue.

THE COURT: If you narrow it to any allegations of bias impacting decisions as to classification, that's fine.

MR. DARLING: Okay. What about just racial bias against Latino inmates?

Case 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM $\,$ Document 122 $\,$ Filed 12/18/24 $\,$ Page 10 of 44 $\,$

THE COURT: Again, I think that's too broad. If there
-- if it is a bias against Latino inmates that affected
classification decisions, fine.

MR. DARLING: Okay. The issue, Your Honor, is that

Burnes is the -- is the person who's in charge of this entire

SHU area --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

11:53:46

11:54:02

11:54:12

11:54:13 8

1

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

11:54:4316

11:54:4417

11:55:0923

MR. DARLING: -- and so, you know, his -- his -- not just his leadership, but his ability to assign and to look the other way and to urge, you know, his subordinates on, to me opens the door to just his general bias that he might have that -- that not -- might not just be a sustained allegation as to classification, but, you know, his bias against, you know, Southern Hispanic inmates -- because it would affect not just his own actions, but his subordinates.

THE COURT: Mr. Duggan?

MR. DUGGAN: I honestly didn't really follow that argument, but it -- you know, I would object to the characterization of Burnes as the leader. He's a sergeant.

There's a lieutenant above him. And as to some -- general bias against Southern Hispanic inmates, I agree with the Court, that I don't see the relevance of that.

MR. DARLING: If I could -- I mean, I just want to respond to two things. First, that Mr. Duggan is saying he doesn't understand the leadership issue. There -- we have --

Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Page 11 of 44 we've deposed many people. Multiple witnesses have said that --1 2 that Burnes is the supervisor of the SHU area. So he certainly supervises the line officers, point number one. 3 Point number two is the -- the -- the race and prison 11:55:33 5 gang identification of inmates is very important to the classification process itself. So we have -- we've heard 6 7 testimony that a factor in deciding which inmates go with the other --8 THE COURT: Sure. Gang affiliation. 11:55:50 9 MR. DARLING: Exactly. And so that's why -- because 11:55:5410 11 this person has control over this area, that -- and -- and that 12 someone's race and alleged prison gang connection affects it, I think his bias can infect lots of things. 13 11:56:0814 THE COURT: All right. So if you narrow this to 15 allegations of racial bias against Southern -- I don't know the 16 best way for you that you want to characterize it. 11:56:2317 MR. DARLING: Hispanics. THE COURT: Hispanics would be great -- inmates. 11:56:2418 MR. DARLING: Yeah. Yes. 11:56:2819 11:56:3120 THE COURT: I'll allow that. Thank you, Your Honor. 11:56:3221 MR. DARLING: 11:56:3922 THE COURT: Seventeen, too broad. All inmate 23 complaints against -- against you [sic] from five years before,

up to the present. As I understand it, in order to be

discoverable, inmate complaints must be similar in nature to the

24

25

Page 12 of 44

```
complaint or incident at issue. So the inmate complaints would
        1
        2
             have to be, I think, inappropriately classifying or housing
             inmates together without following the procedures required.
         3
                       MR. DARLING: I would say it's not just -- it is
11:57:17
        5
             classification, Your Honor, but the other is acts of retaliation
             against inmates for complaints -- for, basically, any complaint
         6
        7
             made against --
                       THE COURT: Who was being retaliated here, Osuna?
11:57:31 8
                       MR. DARLING: The allegation is that Romero had made
11:57:34 9
             complaints against Burnes and that as a form of retaliation --
       10
                       THE COURT: He put him in the cell.
11:57:4111
                       MR. DARLING: Exactly.
11:57:4312
11:57:4413
                       THE COURT: All right.
11:57:4414
                       MR. DARLING: So I --
11:57:4515
                       THE COURT: Well, that would make it similar enough.
11:57:4816
                       MR. DARLING: Certainly. So that's why it's
       17
             classification but, two, retaliation.
11:57:5218
                       THE COURT: All right.
                       MR. DUGGAN: So that's --
11:57:5419
                       THE COURT: But --
11:57:5620
11:57:5621
                       MR. DUGGAN: Is it -- yeah.
11:57:5822
                       THE COURT: Retaliation -- go ahead. I'm sorry,
       23
            Mr. Duggan.
                       MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. I just want to clarify here. Are
11:58:0124
             we talking about classification that -- that is retaliation by
       25
```

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24

Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 se 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Page 13 of 44 classifying? Is that what --1 THE COURT: Yes. 11:58:13 MR. DUGGAN: Okay. So it's retaliation by 11:58:14 3 classifying -- allegations of the -- that "Burnes retaliated 4 against me by classifying me or by housing me in a certain way." 5 THE COURT: Otherwise, we're going to get too far 11:58:23 7 afield. We're going to get denial of commissary for a day as -complaints of that nature that might be considered retaliatory. 8 Again, these have to be similar to the incident of complaint at 9 10 issue. Same approach will apply to 18, personnel complaints. 11:58:3911 12 I don't know what a personnel complaint is, other than I assume you mean a complaint made by other members of the staff. 13 11:58:5414 MR. DARLING: Or -- or his supervisors. So --11:58:5815 THE COURT: Right. 11:58:5816 MR. DARLING: -- non-inmates. CDCR --11:59:0017 THE COURT: So it would be the personal complaints about racism against Hispanic inmates, complaints about 18 retaliatory -- retaliation as a factor in classification, and 19 complaints about failure to follow required procedures in 20 classifying and housing inmates. 21 All right? 11:59:2922 Drugs provided to Mr. Osuna. Defendants have already 11:59:4123 24 agreed to produce the medication records. Doesn't that resolve

25

the dispute?

Filed 12/18/24 Oase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Page 14 of 44 Well, Your Honor, I think the issue is MR. DARLING: 11:59:51 2 that there's the pending order regarding Osuna's mental health records that hasn't been ruled on, and I -- it's my 3 understanding that defendants' position is that some of the 4 records include information about his mental health, and so that 5 they have not been produced in their entirety because some --6 THE COURT: I understand that, too, but I also 12:00:13 7 understood that they had separately produced the medication 8 administration records. 9 MR. DARLING: I --12:00:2210 THE COURT: Did those records also exclude medications 12:00:2211 dealing with mental health treatment? 12 12:00:2813 MR. DARLING: It's my understanding that they've 14 produced some, but not all of his medication records because the 15 documents are commingled. 12:00:3616 THE COURT: All right. MR. DARLING: And -- but I also have -- do not recall 12:00:3717 seeing what Osuna was taking in March of 2019. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Duggan? 12:00:4719 12:00:4920 MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. So let me -- let me clarify. This is one that plaintiffs' counsel brought up during -- recently 21 during Thanksgiving week, and we took a look at it again and 22

said, "Yeah, okay. We can produce that." So we haven't

produced it yet, but what's going to be produced is the

23

24

25

medication records.

Oase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 15 of 44 So the -- we're taking the position that the 12:01:07 1 2 medication records are not the mental health records that are 3 protected by Jaffee. THE COURT: So the mental health -- the medications 12:01:15 will be produced? 5 MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. 12:01:19 6 THE COURT: Even if they are mental health 12:01:19 7 medications? 8 12:01:22 9 MR. DUGGAN: Yes. 12:01:2210 THE COURT: Okay. MR. DARLING: And that includes March of 2019? 12:01:2411 MR. DUGGAN: Yes. 12:01:2712 12:01:2813 THE COURT: Good. 12:01:3014 Okay. That takes us to the C-file. What's going on 15 with the C-file? 12:01:3516 MR. DARLING: So the C-file is not a unified document. 17 It's basically, you know, a series of documents that relate to 18 an inmate. 12:01:4219 THE COURT: Right. 12:01:4220 MR. DARLING: And they, of course, have produced lots of documents, but they haven't produced everything, and -- and 21 22 these are kind of connected to -- to some other requests, it 23 turns out, but certainly there's not the mental health records, 24 and I don't think there's complete records about the

classification decisions of Osuna because he had been

25

Filed 12/18/24 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Page 16 of 44 single-celled on multiple occasions. 1 So that he had gone through a process of being 12:02:09 2 determined to either be single-celled or remain single-celled --3 they call it an ICC chrono. And so all of those documents 4 because a committee, in classifying an inmate, will rely on a 5 bunch of documents, including his mental health records and 6 7 statements. And so it's either not been produced or defendants' 12:02:32 8 position is that they don't know what -- all the documents that 9 10 the ICC committee's relied on, and -- and it's, like, wait a 11 second, you -- we -- you need to track that down. THE COURT: What are the limitations on having these 12:02:5012 13 documents -- financial health documents produced? 12:02:5814 MR. DARLING: It's my understanding that their 15 position is that they're waiting on the Court's order as to the 16 mental health records. 12:03:0417 THE COURT: Well, at this point I usually turn to counsel and say, "What's wrong with a good old-fashioned 18 confidentiality order?" 19

MR. DARLING: And we have that, by the way.

THE COURT: Right.

12:03:1120

12:03:1321

12:03:1322

12:03:1423

12:03:2125

24

MR. DUGGAN: Yeah.

THE COURT: So seems to me to -- getting these documents and the information they contain is pretty important.

MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. It's -- it -- the mental health

Page 17 of 44

Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM records, in particular communications with a mental health 1 2 provider, are absolutely privileged under the Jaffee case. we have to assert that privilege as Osuna's mental health 3 provider, and so that's -- and so that's been our position. 4 Privilege hasn't been waived so far as we know, and so 12:03:43 5 that's why we've not produced mental health records related to 6 7 Osuna. 12:03:53 8 9 10

THE COURT: But I -- if I make the finding that the need to obtain the evidence contained in those records outweighs the privacy interest of third parties, which includes Mr. Osuna and his victims and relatives -- if I make that finding, is that sufficient to overcome the privilege?

> MR. DARLING: Yes.

11

12

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

12:04:4923

12:04:1613

12:04:1714

12:04:2416

MR. DUGGAN: That is not -- not my understanding. understanding is it's an absolute privilege under Jaffee.

MR. DARLING: I would point out, Your Honor, this is very convenient for defendants. And this has been briefed, but I think the reason why they're so adamant about this purported absolute privilege is because we have statements from Osuna himself stating, "I told them I wanted to kill again," and the person he told was the social worker who was part of the classification committee.

THE COURT: All right. And is there any other source in which the same information could be obtained or contained? Is this the only type of document that's going to have this

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 18 of 44 information?

12:05:4312

12:06:0017

12:06:1820

12:06:2422

12:05:10

12:05:22

MR. DUGGAN: Well, I mean, yeah, if it's -- if what they're looking for is communication between Osuna and his mental health professional, then, I mean, that's only going to be in his mental health records.

MR. DARLING: Well, there's -- a few things,

Your Honor. I think they're taking an expansive definition of

mental health records because there are other records where it

relates to conversations with CDCR staff about his state of

mind, his desire to kill, that then, I think, is being read as

mental health records, number one.

But, number two, as it relates to -- because it is related to the classification process and notice, as the Court said, in this balancing test, you know, it should -- it should -- the interest, obviously, weighs in disclosure, especially given the protective order.

THE COURT: And we're clear that the parts of the C-file that have been or are going to be produced do not contain the information that we're arguing about now; is that accurate?

MR. DUGGAN: That's -- I'm not sure what you mean by the information we're arguing about now.

THE COURT: The -- to take Mr. Darling's position at face value, Mr. Osuna's statements to mental health treaters or others that he wanted to kill somebody and was ready to act promptly given the opportunity.

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 19 of 44

12:06:43

12:06:46

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

24

12:07:4214

12:07:5718

12:08:1222

12:08:1423

12:08:1825

MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. I haven't -- yeah. I have not
seen that in his C-file, no.

THE COURT: All right. All right. Well, it seems to me that the balance in this case, given the importance of the information in terms of understanding the information that was available at the time the classification decisions were made, that those interests would outweigh the privacy interests of the third parties, particularly given the protective order that we have in this place and given the absence of the information in the part of the C-file that has not been produced, the absence of that information anywhere else -- the inability to get it anywhere else. So I think we should -- I will compel the production of the entire C-file.

If you believe that there are any additional confidentiality protections that need to be added to that, whether it's attorney's eyes only or something of that nature, I welcome you to consider that.

MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. I mean, there's -- there's additional -- there were additional -- there's other documents that we didn't produce in the C-file; for example, names and addresses of Osuna's victims, names and addresses of --

THE COURT: I don't think we need those.

MR. DUGGAN: Okay. -- names and addresses of Osuna's
family --

THE COURT: I don't think we need those. I think the

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 20 of 44 key here is what he told other people at the prison. MR. DUGGAN: And then --12:08:24 2 THE COURT: And about his intent to --12:08:26 3 MR. DUGGAN: And then --12:08:27 4 THE COURT: -- commit violence. 12:08:28 5 MR. DUGGAN: And then documents from after --12:08:30 6 THE COURT: I don't think we need those. 12:08:34 7 MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. -- documents from after 12:08:36 8 March 2019. Okay. 9 THE COURT: Fingerprint documents, you tell me if 12:08:4010 11 that's important. It's the mental health records and the 12 documents from -- and the medical records that are the important 13 parts before the March 2019 incident. MR. DARLING: The one thing I would add, Your Honor, 12:08:5914 15 is after the incident, to the extent that he made statements 16 about --12:09:0617 THE COURT: About the incident. 12:09:0618 MR. DARLING: -- the incident, I would --THE COURT: That's fine. 12:09:0819 12:09:1320 Okay. MR. DARLING: But, yeah, in terms of the -- the 12:09:1321 defendant has redacted other stuff. So I think, in terms of 22 redacting victims' names, numbers --23 THE COURT: That's fine. 12:09:2024 12:09:2125 MR. DARLING: Yeah, of course.

Oase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 21 of 44 THE COURT: I agree. 12:09:22 1 Okay. I think that takes us to 48, all documents that 12:09:23 2 pertain to any act of violence by Mr. Osuna since 2011. 3 MR. DARLING: So the -- the defendants have produced, 12:09:40 actually, quite a number of -- of prior acts of violence by 5 Osuna, usually in the form of what's called an RVR, or rule 6 7 violation report, but in the act of meeting and conferring, it -- it became -- it seemed to me that there are other 8 9 incidents that have not been produced, especially descriptions that are not in an RVR. 10 12:10:11 THE COURT: Response? 12:10:1312 MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. We've produced the RVRs from 13 before March 2019, and some -- some of the ones after March 2019 14 have not been produced as part of the C-file because, as we 15 mentioned before, those -- those are relevant. 12:10:3016 MR. DARLING: But the issue, Mr. Duggan, is any issues 17 of violence that are outside of the RVRs. I don't think those have been produced. 18 MR. DUGGAN: I don't -- we're not withholding anything 12:10:4019 20 on that. 12:10:4321 THE COURT: Are there any -- are there any documents that aren't called RVRs that would contain --22

MR. DUGGAN: Oh, no.

THE COURT: -- information about prior violence?

MR. DUGGAN: Okay. Yeah, there may -- yeah.

12:10:4923

12:10:4924

12:10:5225

Page 22 of 44

may be that in his mental health records if he's talking -- if 1 2 he's talking to his mental health provider about prior acts of 3 violence. THE COURT: And are we now going to get those because 12:11:05 5 of the ruling on RFP 43? MR. DUGGAN: No. The -- there is a separate group of 12:11:12 7 mental health records that are not part of the C-file. So --12:11:19 8 THE COURT: All right. MR. DUGGAN: -- yeah. 12:11:19 9 THE COURT: To the extent that separate group of 12:11:1910 11 mental health records that is not part of the C-file contains 12 information relating to prior acts of violence by Mr. Osuna 13 since 2011 up until March 19th of 2019, produce them. 12:11:4014 MR. DUGGAN: Understood. 12:11:4115 THE COURT: Okay. 12:11:4716 MR. DARLING: Thank you, Your Honor. 12:11:4917 THE COURT: Number 50, IST training provided on March 10, 2019. Defendant says it's already produced training 18 documents but not a specific training document on the date in 19 question. Are -- have there been any updates? Have you found 20 21 anything more? 12:12:1422 MR. DUGGAN: No updates yet. We are still looking, 23 Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. 12:12:1724 12:12:1725 MR. DARLING: This isn't -- an issue, Your Honor, that

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24

Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Page 23 of 44 came up in the meet-and-confer process is a lot -- sometimes the 1 2 responses will say, like, "We'll produce. It's ongoing," and yet, like, here we are, and nothing has been produced. And so I 3 think the issue isn't the decision to withhold, but the decision 4 to go out and find it and then produce it and -- because it --5 it seems like this -- obviously, it's an ongoing duty, but if it 6 7 hasn't been produced and, you know, we're scheduling depositions, I think it's time that, you know, that they produce 8 shortly. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Duggan, what is the status -- what 12:12:4810 11 have you done to search, and what are you intending to continue 12 to do? 12:12:5613 MR. DUGGAN: Well, I mean, without revealing 14

MR. DUGGAN: Well, I mean, without revealing attorney-client communications, you know, we looked in the -- in the usual places, and now we're going to look in an additional place that I know is happening now. So --

THE COURT: All right. Will you be in a position to make a report to Mr. Darling by Friday as to the status of the additional search?

MR. DUGGAN: Friday may be too soon, but I will -- I can endeavor to do that.

THE COURT: All right. If not Friday, Monday.

MR. DUGGAN: Thank you.

MR. DARLING: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Next is documents that the ICC

12:13:1920

12:13:1017

21

15

16

18

19

12:13:2422

12:13:2723

12:13:2924

12:13:3025

Page 24 of 44

Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM reviewed or relied on in the classification decision, and the 1 2 response is they would have reviewed the C-file, and the only other thing that they would have reviewed would be the mental 3 health records that have been withheld from the other C-file 4 documents. Are those records now going to be produced? 5 MR. DUGGAN: Yes. 12:14:03 12:14:04 7 12:14:06 8 issue, though, Your Honor, is that if there's any other 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 know what they looked at. 12:14:3116 17 should be address- -- addressed --12:14:3618 19 20 21

22

12:14:5323

12:14:5324

12:15:0025

THE COURT: Then that should take care of that. MR. DARLING: Are there any -- I guess my -- the other non-mental health, non-C-file records, what else has been produced. And it's my understanding that it's not just a claim of privilege, but also that defendants' position is that, "Well, we don't know what they looked at." And it's, like, wait a second. You've got to go out and find to make sure that you MR. DUGGAN: I think that this is something that THE COURT: That's a deposition question, and if, based on the deposition testimony, they say, "Well, we also looked at X," well, you're going to get X. And if it wasn't previously produced, you may get a chance to ask some additional deposition questions based on X --MR. DARLING: Okay. THE COURT: -- but I agree. It looks like the defendants have made a reasonable

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 25 of 44 response to their understanding of what is ordinarily reviewed, 1 2 and to the extent these individuals have -- who did the review have additional information, you can find that out at their 3 deposition. 4 MR. DARLING: Okay. But -- but -- as -- what I 12:15:19 5 understand the Court's position on 58: Based on the prior 6 7 issues with the other RFPs, that they will produce mental health records that were reviewed in the ICC process? 8 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 12:15:34 9 MR. DUGGAN: Well, we -- as I say, we don't know which 12:15:3510 11 ones were -- were reviewed, but we'll -- we'll produce --THE COURT: But those are going to be produced 12:15:4212 13 anyway --12:15:4414 MR. DUGGAN: Yes. 12:15:4515 **THE COURT:** -- because -- in response to a separate 16 request. 12:15:4817 MR. DUGGAN: Yes. 12:15:4818 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Document- -- I'm on 62, 19 documents that include or reference statements by Mr. Osuna that 20 reflect a desire to commit violence. Isn't -- aren't those going to be picked up by the other documents that we've ruled 21 22 will be provided? 12:16:1323 MR. DUGGAN: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. 12:16:1524 12:16:1725 MR. DUGGAN: I think so, yeah.

Filed 12/18/24 Case 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Page 26 of 44 I mean, I guess I don't know what I MR. DARLING: 12:16:18 1 2 don't know, Your Honor. If there's any other place where there's -- a desire to commit violence is being stated because 3 that could be made in a non-mental health record, of course. 4 THE COURT: I agree, but you're looking at his C-file. 12:16:30 5 You're going to get the mental health records. So I think --6 7 and then you're going to get deposition testimony that may provide non-document responses. 8 MR. DARLING: Well, here's an issue, Your Honor, is 12:16:47 9 that the defendants have produced a audio interview of 10 11 Mr. Osuna, and she talks about how he's been stating his desire 12 to kill, but I don't know if it's considered a C-file or mental 13 health record as to the investigation into the killing of 14 Romero, because he might have made other statements in -- in --15 related to that investigation. So that might be a separate 16 bundle, and then that, I think, has been invoked as, like, oh, 17 there's an ongoing prosecution. 12:17:1918

But it's, like, yeah, but if it's an admission by Osuna in the context of this investigation, I would think --

THE COURT: Was Mr. Osuna interviewed and that interview recorded as part of the investigation?

19

21

23

24

12:17:2520

12:17:3122

12:17:4025

MR. DARLING: And -- there is an interview with Osuna that has been produced, but I don't know if there has been subsequent interviews of him.

THE COURT: Have you asked Mr. Duggan that?

Filed 12/18/24 Oase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Page 27 of 44 MR. DARLING: Yeah. Well, I mean, that's what this 12:17:42 request contemplates, the desire to commit violence. 2 THE COURT: Okay. But the specific question: Was 12:17:47 3 there a additional interview of Mr. Duggan [sic] that was 4 recorded either before or after the May incident? 5 MR. DUGGAN: So, yeah, we've -- there's two 12:18:06 7 interviews, and we've produced both. THE COURT: Okay. 12:18:10 8 MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. 12:18:11 9 THE COURT: No other interviews? 12:18:1210 MR. DUGGAN: No. 12:18:1311 12:18:1412 THE COURT: Okay. That takes us to 74, which asks 13 about the decision to single-cell Mr. Osuna and clarifying that 14 the decision that you're asking about is the one that changed an 15 earlier decision allowing him to be double-celled and converting 16 him to single cell only. 12:18:4417 MR. DARLING: Yes. 12:18:4518 THE COURT: And the defendant says that it doesn't know of any other documents beyond the ones it's already 19 20 produced. So this sounds like one that you need to follow up in the deposition and come back if it appears to be that there are 21 other sources of documents with this information. 22 12:19:1023 MR. DARLING: Okay. Fair enough. Thank you, 24 Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. The documents the Corcoran 12:19:1125

Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Page 28 of 44 prison ICC reviewed in January of '17 -- 2019, I'm sorry, and 1 2 the cell status review, looks like the same sort of analysis. Has this been -- previously been produced, Mr. Duggan? 12:19:29 MR. DUGGAN: It's -- it's the same analysis as -- as 12:19:35 4 previous ones. So, yeah, they'll -- some of the mental health 5 records that we've talked about will be produced in response --6 THE COURT: All right. 12:19:44 7 12:19:45 8 MR. DUGGAN: -- in response to this one, yep. THE COURT: So the -- well, can you at least provide a 12:19:48 9 list of the documents the ICC would have reviewed in the cell 10 status review of January 2019? 11 MR. DARLING: Thank you, Your Honor. That -- no, I 12:19:5912 13 just want to flag this. This is all -- exactly. That 14 articulation is what I've been seeking and has not been 15 produced, and that's -- the evasiveness is why we're here. 12:20:1016 THE COURT: Okay. 12:20:117 MR. DUGGAN: That's -- it's not evasive. We don't know exactly which documents they --18 THE COURT: Can you tell us the ones you do know? 12:20:1519 12:20:1920 MR. DUGGAN: If -- I mean, again, I agree with the Court's previous statement that that seems like a deposition 21 22 question. THE COURT: Well, except here's where it's a little 12:20:2523 24 bit different: We're talking about a routine review. There --25 in every prison that I'm aware of, these kinds of reviews are

Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Page 29 of 44 subject to a kind of a protocol. Here's the steps you go 1 2 through; here's the stuff you look at. If you can provide a list of the documents that at least in the ordinary course would 3 be reviewed in a cell-status review, then with that to start 4 with, Mr. Darling is equipped to ask deposition questions about 5 whether other types of documents were also reviewed. 6 MR. DUGGAN: I mean, I think that, you know, we have 12:21:13 7 already done that. You've got -- you're looking at the --8 9 you're looking at the C-file, and you're looking at -- if you have a mental health professional present, then you're looking 10 at mental health records. 11 MR. DARLING: But apart from the mental health issues, 12:21:2612 13 which -- which the Court has addressed, there -- there's still 14 an issue where potentially there's a third bundle of documents 15 that we don't know, and it seems like defendant can inquire as 16 to whether other, you know, non-mental health, non-C-file 17 documents were reviewed and provide those.

THE COURT: But it's really two questions here as I read RFP No. 84 and 85 together. Is there a folder labeled "Cell Status Review, January 2019, Osuna," something like that?

MR. DUGGAN: That -- that is a subset, and that would be like a subset of his C-file. No.

THE COURT: All right. So it's in the C-file?

MR. DUGGAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Any --

12:21:4718

20

12:22:1121

22

12:22:1623

12:22:1924

12:22:1925

Oase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 30 of 44 MR. DUGGAN: And looking at it -- they'd be looking at 12:22:20 1 2 it on a computer. THE COURT: Any cell status review is going to be in 12:22:24 the C-file? MR. DUGGAN: The cell status review document itself, 12:22:29 yes. THE COURT: All right. 12:22:33 7 MR. DARLING: But the documents --12:22:34 8 THE COURT: What about the other documents looked at 12:22:35 9 in conducting the cell status review? 10 MR. DUGGAN: Those are in the C-file, but it's not all 12:22:4111 of the C-file. 12 12:22:4513 THE COURT: I'm sorry. It's --12:22:4714 MR. DUGGAN: It's -- you know, you would be -- the 15 person conducting the cell status review would look at documents 16 that are -- some of the documents that are in the C-file. 12:22:5517 THE COURT: Would they ordinarily look at other kinds 18 of documents? MR. DUGGAN: If there's a mental health professional, 12:23:0019 20 the mental health professional might -- would also look at the 21 mental health records. 12:23:0822 THE COURT: So the answers here are the C-file and the 23 mental health records? 12:23:1424 MR. DUGGAN: Yes. 12:23:1525 **THE COURT:** That's what they would have looked at?

Filed 12/18/24 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Page 31 of 44 MR. DUGGAN: 12:23:17 1 Yes. THE COURT: And have you provided the documents that 12:23:18 2 they looked at in January of 2019? 3 MR. DUGGAN: Apart from what we've already talked 12:23:24 about that have been withheld previously, then yes. 5 THE COURT: All right. And after this hearing, what 12:23:29 7 will still be withheld? MR. DUGGAN: I don't think there's going to be 12:23:40 8 anything that going to be withheld after this --9 THE COURT: That's the point. 12:23:4210 MR. DUGGAN: Okay. 12:23:4311 THE COURT: So when you make the production that the 12:23:4312 13 rulings of the hearing will lead to, then you'll have --14 Mr. Darling should have everything that the ICC reviewed or 15 produced in its cell status review. 12:24:0416 MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. 12:24:0517 **THE COURT:** Is that right? 12:24:0518 MR. DUGGAN: Yes. What I'm understanding, yeah. THE COURT: Okay. I think that deals with all the 12:24:0619 discovery issues that you brought to my attention. 20 12:24:2121 Thank you, Your Honor. Just one -- just MR. DARLING: 22 anticipating an issue is that -- because, to me, the Court's position is clear, but if the -- we just don't want defendant to 23 24 say, "Oh, the request for the order -- the standalone request

for order re mental health hasn't been ruled on, so we can't do

25

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 32 of 44 it since we're waiting on an order." So I want just either 1 2 clarifi- -- clarification from Mr. Duggan that he's not going to do that or if the Court can issue that separate order --3 THE COURT: Why don't you confer, draft me an order 12:24:48 that you can agree on at least as to form, and get it to me. 5 MR. DARLING: Okay. Well, on that issue, Your Honor, 12:24:56 7 we did submit -- I did submit an order. That was at docket 94. And then the parties had briefings, and so we can -- I don't 8 know if the Court wants --9 THE COURT: I think I've given you enough guidance 12:25:0910 11 since then. MR. DARLING: Thank you. Okay. Okay. I'll follow up 12:25:1112 13 and do that. 12:25:1414 THE COURT: All right. 12:25:1415 MR. DARLING: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 12:25:1516 THE COURT: Okay. Couple of other things that we 17 might be able to deal with now. There's a motion for -- by the plaintiff for leave to file an amended complaint adding a new 18 defendant. As I understand it, the late discovery responses are 19 the reasons for the late amendment. 20 The plaintiff initially agreed to extend the deadline 12:25:3921 for the discovery responses to late in August. The discovery 22 wasn't produced until three weeks afterwards, around 23 24 September 11, and when the defendant confirmed that the

plaintiff had agreed to extend the defendants' discovery

25

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 33 of 44 deadline, the defendant promised to stipulate to an extension of time to amend pleadings, if that becomes necessary, and now, apparently, the defendant is opposing the extension of time perhaps on the ground that it's not necessary.

MR. DUGGAN: The -- yeah. We're not opposing a motion for extension of time, Your Honor, and I -- I -- when we wrote the opposition to the amendment, I had forgotten about that -- that agreement. But, you know, we do oppose the amendment itself because we believe that the allegations against the new defendant, Mr. Beam, are not -- is not the same case or controversy as what's been asserted against Mr. Burnes.

THE COURT: Mr. Darling, did you want to respond?

MR. DARLING: Please, yes. I'm glad they've conceded the first point, but as to not related, it is exactly related.

The -- the lawsuit -- the second lawsuit, filed in 2021, is about CDCR employees sharing the photo. Obviously, it's not just one defendant. That's why we have Does.

And so --

12:26:5012

12:26:5213

12:27:0918

12:27:0919

12:27:1020

12:26:20

THE COURT: Right.

MR. DARLING: -- we learned about a second guy who -who, in a CDCR investigation, was found to have e-mailed,
multiple instances, people at then -- effectively, at least
23 people saw these photos, and so it's this viral effect. And
so this is -- this is the lawsuit. The lawsuit is CDCR
employees sharing crime scene -- grisly crime scene photos of

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 34 of 44

Romero. This is -- this is the lawsuit.

1

3

4

5

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

12:28:3719

12:27:36

12:27:37

12:27:46

12:27:57

12:27:5810

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DUGGAN: And in the -- in the original complaint, it was only Corcoran employees, not CDCR employees. So they're expanding it to other prisons with this amendment.

THE COURT: They're expanding the receipt in -- and further distribution in other prisons of what originated in Corcoran, correct?

MR. DUGGAN: Well, yes.

THE COURT: All right. I really -- I think it would be more complicated than clarifying to require a new lawsuit to assert the complaints against Beam. The amended complaint makes minimal changes to the facts that underlie the claims that are at the heart of this case, and they've always included sharing photos, which is what Mr. Beam is alleged to have done. And the discovery of Beam's identity and potential liability came from the documents that the defendants disclosed during the discovery process.

I don't see any evidence of bad faith or undue delay or dilatoriness, and I don't see unfair prejudice in allowing it. So I am going to grant the -- the motion to amend. I do want the defendant to -- unopposed motion to file a surreply, I'm granting that, and I want that filed because it clarifies that Mr. Beam is not going to be represented by the same counsel as the existing panel.

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 35 of 44 MR. DUGGAN: Thank you, Your Honor. And just on --12:29:12 2 still on that case, the -- the close of discovery is currently, 3 under this scheduling order, December 13th in that case. I imagine that will have to be moved now that we're adding a 4 party. 5 THE COURT: About 60 days. 12:29:30 MR. DARLING: Your Honor, could we ask for 90? 12:29:32 7 THE COURT: That's fine. 12:29:35 8 12:29:35 9 MR. DARLING: Because -- because -- and, actually, the other issue is if, in fact, Mr. Duggan's office is not going to 10 11 be representing him, then there might be delays on that. 12 Just -- just so you know, I -- I subpoenaed Beam for a 13 deposition, and there's briefing on that, and we could basically 14 set that aside, if he's going to be separately --12:30:0115 MR. DUGGAN: Represented. 12:30:0216 MR. DARLING: -- represented, and then -- and file an 17 answer. But, one, if he -- if he himself files a motion to 12:30:0518 dismiss, that will delay things, or, two, if there's just delay 19 in -- in me talking to counsel. So just thinking this through, 20 you know, I -- I need to have time -- at least 30 days to -- to 21 propound documents on Beam, and then time to depose him. So --22 THE COURT: So why don't you and Mr. Duggan confer 12:30:2623

with others and draft and send me a, hopefully, agreed proposed

amended scheduling order that will allow for all of this work to

24

25

Filed 12/18/24 se 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Page 36 of 44 occur. 1 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. DARLING: 12:30:41 THE COURT: And if you could do that by Monday of next 12:30:43 3 week, we'll get it done promptly. 4 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. DARLING: 12:30:48 THE COURT: All right. Anything else on the schedule 12:30:50 7 for today? MR. DARLING: So there was a -- yes. One issue is --12:31:03 8 so plaintiff served subpoenas on Beam, but also a 30(b)(6) 9 10 witness for the second case. And so I quess, if it's -- if Beam 11 has a new counsel, but the 30(b)(6) is represented by 12 Mr. Duggan's office, then would that issue of the -- a 13 subpoena -- because it's -- it seems kind of -- we'll be --14 basically have -- we're going -- we're going to have some 15 briefing in the Central District, because I'm in the Central 16 District. So Mr. Duggan filed the motion to quash in the 17 Central District, but then it might move back to the Eastern 18 District to you. So I'm just, for housekeeping purposes -- because we 12:31:5619 have this pending 30(b)(6) deposition that -- quite frankly, I 20 don't even think we should have a motion to quash here because 21 this should be regularly scheduled. I just -- I'm just -- I 22 kind of lost in terms of how to -- how to clean this up. 23 THE COURT: What are you asking me to do? 12:32:1824 12:32:2225 MR. DARLING: I guess -- I'm just -- I guess I'm

se 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 37 of 44 flagging it, but then --1 THE COURT: Okay. 12:32:26 MR. DARLING: -- if, after the briefing in the Central 12:32:26 3 District, in the event that the Central District moves it over 4 to the Eastern District just to resolve it quickly --5 THE COURT: Where is the subpoena going to be 12:32:35 7 enforced? MR. DARLING: Well, see, because it is -- a Zoom 12:32:39 8 remote appearance is fine. It could be enforced in the Eastern 9 10 District. It doesn't --THE COURT: All right. 12:32:4711 MR. DARLING: People do not have to come to my office, 12:32:4812 13 which is why I -- it was going to -- it was my -- that it should 14 be in the Eastern District. 12:32:5315 THE COURT: Then, as I understand the rules, the court 16 where the subpoena is going to be enforced should be the one to 17 resolve issues regarding its enforcement. 12:33:0318 MR. DARLING: That's my position, too, and that's why 19 12:33:0620 MR. DUGGAN: Our view was it was -- because the 21 address on the subpoena was in the Central District, then 22 that's -- that's the court that should hear the motion to quash. 12:33:1623 MR. DARLING: And that, Your Honor, just seems silly. 24 It's a remote Zoom deposition. Of course my address is on there 25 because I'm the attorney doing it, but it should stay in front

Filed 12/18/24 se 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Page 38 of 44 of --1 THE COURT: To the extent we are interpreting the 12:33:26 2 phrase where the subpoena will be enforced or where the 3 subpoena -- what the subpoena requires will be performed, I 4 5 think that should govern. MR. DARLING: Right. So that's the Eastern District. 12:33:37 THE COURT: Exactly. 12:33:40 7 Yeah. Okay. So -- so with that, 12:33:41 8 MR. DARLING: Mr. Duggan, would you disagree about just refiling this motion 9 10 to quash in the Eastern District and saving us the time of -of --11 (Multiple speakers.) 12:33:5212 12:33:5713 MR. DUGGAN: Yeah. I mean, I'll have to -- I don't 14 remember it saying in the subpoena that it was going to be by 15 Zoom, and so that's why I did file a motion to quash in the --16 in the Central District. So I would have to look back at that. 17 I mean, I think if you want to do a 30(b)(6) deposition, it sounds like our -- you know, Beam is -- the issues are --18 surrounding Beam are going to be in the case. 19 12:34:2020 I think you should -- we should maybe just, you know -- you can do that through us. We do represent CDCR. 21 So maybe, rather than doing the subpoena, we just discuss it 22 between me and Mr. Darling. 23 THE COURT: I think that sounds terrific.

MR. DARLING:

Okay. And if any issues, we'll go back

12:34:3524

12:34:3725

Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Page 39 of 44 to Your Honor, but, hopefully, we just -- regularly scheduled motion -- I mean, regularly scheduled deposition.

THE COURT: I have -- I'm sure that I may have asked this question before. This is one of the grimmest and goriest cases I suspect any of us has encountered. It will not be an easy case to try, at least not easy for the jury that will have to decide it, and there seem to me to be all sorts of reasons that every party to this case should want to consider settlement as a resolution rather than a full-blown trial.

If we have to try it, that's fine with me, but I don't want to miss an opportunity, if one arises, to pursue a mediated resolution.

MR. DARLING: Sure.

THE COURT: Are we at that point? Do you have enough information now to make a presentation to a mediator, if that's what is appropriate, or some kind of analysis what might be appropriate as a way to resolve the case? You tell me.

MR. DARLING: Your Honor, I think we can walk and chew gum. So I think discovery can proceed and the parties can schedule a mediation. And I will say that the parties agree that the mediation should contemplate both cases. So looking at --

THE COURT: I agree.

MR. DARLING: -- a universal settlement.

I think we have -- I mean, this is so grisly that

12:36:2523

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

12:35:3510

12:35:4913

12:35:5114

12:36:12 18

12:34:46

12:36:2524

12:36:2725

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 40 of 44 there's kind of like a threshold number that they don't agree to, and so I think we might already start off at just being, you know, too wide a distance. And in my experience, CDCR is so used to dealing with pro se plaintiffs that the pain -- the actual settlements are so wildly lower. And so, to be frank, I think that they might need a verdict against them to reset their expectations that --

12:37:5524

12:36:58

12:37:1512

12:37:1713

12:37:2015

THE COURT: On the other hand, to quote something that I just heard a few minutes ago, I suspect CDCR can walk and chew gum at the same time, as well, and is fully aware of the exposure that a case like this might create.

MR. DARLING: Right. So, Your Honor --

THE COURT: But who knows? Who knows what a jury might do?

MR. DARLING: Of course. So the -- so the defendants have agreed to a mediation for a panel mediator. In reading the tea leaves, they haven't been really open to a private one, which is usually -- to me conveys a seriousness of settling, but we have got the ball rolling. We've reached out to the panel mediator, and we've talked about continuing, because the deadline was actually -- is this week. So we're going to continue the time -- the deadline maybe to 60 days, and then, hopefully, we can -- we can mediate this in January or February.

THE COURT: I hate to see the magic window of the holiday season, which is great for mediations, close.

Q	ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24 Page 41 of 44
2:38:02 1	MR. DARLING: I would love I'm happy to mediate
2	this next week, but I don't think I don't know
2:38:08 3	THE COURT: Is that realistic, Ms. Stocker,
4	Mr. Duggan, Mr
2:38:13 5	MS. STOCKER: I haven't heard back from the panel
6	mediator.
2:38:17 7	THE COURT: So tell me about this panel mediator. We
8	don't we may use the same system but call it a different
9	name.
2:38:2510	MS. STOCKER: It's the
2:38:2611	THE COURT: A court adjunct?
2:38:3012	MS. STOCKER: The court has a list of potential
13	mediators. They sent out the list. We chose one
2:38:3614	THE COURT: Okay.
2:38:3615	MS. STOCKER: and we're waiting to hear back from
16	him.
2:38:4017	THE COURT: Are you restricted to the list of panel
18	mediators?
2:38:4719	MR. DARLING: For free mediation, yes. For so
20	private mediation, we could choose whoever, but I this is
21	where I'm saying in I interpreted defendants' wariness to do
22	private mediation as not being serious about settlement, but I'm
23	happy to also do private mediation.
2:39:0424	MR. DUGGAN: And we you know, I did agree to do a
25	private mediation split 50/50. So I'm not so

Filed 12/18/24 Case 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Page 42 of 44 THE COURT: Why don't you do that? Instead of waiting 12:39:14 1 2 around for somebody who's obviously not prioritizing this, I should say, why don't you set up an early private mediation? 3 Can you agree on a private mediator? 4 MR. DARLING: I -- that has also been an issue, 12:39:31 Your Honor. 6 12:39:34 THE COURT: I'll pick. You give me three, I'll pick 7 one. You give me six, I'll pick one. I can -- you let me pick, 8 and I'll pick one. 9 MR. DARLING: Sure. Okay. Would the Court -- would 12:39:4510 11 it seem too time intensive if we try panel and then go to 12 private, or do you think, just for purposes of time, just opt 13 into the private? 12:40:0114 THE COURT: I think it's going to be harder to do a 15 successful mediator -- mediation after an unsuccessful one. 12:40:0916 MR. DARLING: Hmm. 12:40:117 THE COURT: Although people do it all the time. 12:40:1618 MR. DARLING: Okay. 12:40:1719 MR. DUGGAN: I mean, yeah, it sounds to me like you --20 Erin, you feel like the process would go better with a private 21 mediator. So we can discuss amongst ourselves, but maybe we should be considering that option. 22 12:40:2823 THE COURT: Sooner rather than later. MR. DARLING: Yeah. Absolutely. We want -- if 12:40:3224 25 anything -- yes. The -- in -- there was a contemplated

Page 43 of 44

stipulation to extend the time for the panel mediator, and I 1 2 e-mailed today saying 60 days, not 90 days, because I don't want to extend it out too long. So --3 THE COURT: Good. I agree with that. Okay. Let me 12:40:50 know where we are on that. 5 MR. DARLING: Okay. 12:40:55 6 THE COURT: Ms. Stocker, you look like you wanted to 12:40:56 7 8 say something. MS. STOCKER: No. Thank you, Your Honor. 12:40:59 9 THE COURT: All right. So I will --12:41:0110 12:41:0211 MR. DARLING: Your Honor, as it relates to 12 Ms. Stocker -- sorry to interrupt -- the -- her client, Silva, 13 there's still, obviously, no ruling on that, but I would just 14 request a ruling on that so we could then depose Silva. 12:41:1715 THE COURT: All right. I will try to get that to you 16 promptly. 12:41:2417 MR. DARLING: Thank you so much. 12:41:2518 THE COURT: Thank you very much. And you're going to get me the orders and the amended scheduling order that we 19 talked about. 20 12:41:3021 MR. DARLING: Exactly. Yeah. 12:41:3222 And thank you so much. I know this is very unwieldy. 23 \mid So I just thank -- thank the Court for its attention. THE COURT: I don't know, you made Texas procedures 12:41:3824 25 look simple. I'm grateful. Thank you very much. Have a good

ase 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Filed 12/18/24

Filed 12/18/24 se 1:20-cv-00323-LHR-BAM Document 122 Page 44 of 44 1 holiday. MS. STOCKER: Thank you, Your Honor. You, too. 12:41:47 MR. DARLING: 12:41:48 3 Bye. THE COURT: Thank you. You're all excused. 12:41:49 MR. DUGGAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Happy Holidays. 12:41:50 5 (Proceedings concluded at 12:41 p.m.) 12:41:51 7 -000-8 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above matter to the best 9 of my ability and skill, and that any indiscernible designations 10 are because of audio interference that precluded me from 11 12 understanding the words spoken. 13 14 Date: December 18, 2024 /s/ Heather Alcaraz 15 Signature of Court Reporter 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25